

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
  
Plaintiff,  
  
v.  
  
AARON BRUNO FINN,  
  
Defendant.

Case No. CR19-34-RSL

ORDER DENYING EARLY  
TERMINATION OF  
SUPERVISED RELEASE

This matter comes before the Court on defendant Aaron Bruno Finn's "Motion for Early Termination of Supervised Release" (Dkt. # 13).

On December 6, 2013, defendant pleaded guilty to sexual exploitation of a child – transportation of child pornography, in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 2252A(a)(1), (b)(1). Dkt. # 2-2. On February 20, 2014, the U.S. District Court for the District of Alaska sentenced defendant to 72 months of imprisonment and 15 years of supervised release. Dkt. # 2-3. Defendant began his term of supervision on December 24, 2018. Dkt. # 1. This Court accepted jurisdiction over defendant on February 22, 2019. Id.

The Court may "after considering the factors set forth in [18 U.S.C. § 3553(a)] . . . terminate a term of supervised release and discharge the defendant released at any time after the expiration of one year of supervised release . . . if it is satisfied that such action is warranted by the conduct of the defendant released and the interest of justice." 18 U.S.C. § 3583(e). The Court enjoys "discretion to consider a wide range of circumstances when determining whether to grant early termination." United States v. Emmett, 749 F.3d 817, 819 (9th Cir. 2014) (citing United States v. Pregent, 190 F.3d 279, 283 (4th Cir. 1999)).

ORDER DENYING EARLY  
TERMINATION OF SUPERVISED RELEASE - 1

1 Defendant is not a suitable candidate for early termination. The Court commends  
2 defendant on the significant monetary support that he provides to his son and son's mother. See  
3 Dkt. # 13-2. This prosocial behavior alone, however, is insufficient to support early termination.  
4 While the Court also commends defendant on his violation-free record while under supervision,  
5 see Dkt. # 13 at 2, it is concerned by his lack of cooperation with his Probation Officer and  
6 attitude in his sex offender treatment program, see Dkt. # 19 at 2-3. In sum, the Court is not  
7 satisfied that the conduct of the defendant and the interest of justice support early termination of  
8 supervision. See 18 U.S.C. §§ 3583(e)(1), 3553(a). If defendant would like the Court to  
9 seriously consider a future request for early termination of supervised release, he will need to  
10 adopt a renewed attitude towards supervision and cooperate openly with his Probation Officer.

11 Accordingly, defendant's request for early termination of supervised release (Dkt. # 13)  
12 is DENIED. Notwithstanding, the Court supports defendant's desire to relocate to Salem,  
13 Oregon. The Court is amenable to transferring jurisdiction over defendant to the U.S. District  
14 Court for the District of Oregon.

15 IT IS SO ORDERED.

16 DATED this 16<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2022.

17  
18  
19 

20 Robert S. Lasnik  
21 United States District Judge  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28